

In re ANINDYA CHAKRABORTY, Application No. 09/813,576  
Amendment B

### REMARKS

The final Office action dated August 5, 2005, and the references cited have been fully considered. In response, please enter the enclosed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and the following amendments, and consider the following remarks. Reconsideration and/or further prosecution of the application is respectfully requested. No new matter is added herein.

First, the specification is amended herein to clarify the description of computer-readable medium in accordance with the MPEP. No new matter is added with this amendment.

Next, although Applicants respectfully traverse the characterization and application of the references to the claims as presented in the previous Office actions as the terms used in claims must be construed by the Office consistently with the definitions provided in the specification per MPEP § 2111.01, Applicants have elected to incorporate these directly into the claims in order to put the condition in allowance. Therefore, the amendments presented herein do not narrow the claims nor are presented in response to rejections based on cited prior art..

First, Applicants have canceled claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 15-21, 23-28, and 33.

Next, independent claim 14 is amended to include the definitions of the recited bulk and transactional updates and the initialization of the groups to reflect that they all required bulk updating, systematically bulk updating the second database with entries from the first database, with support provided at least on page 6, lines 3 to page 7, line 7, FIGs. 4A-B and 5 and their corresponding description on pages 11-13, as well as the originally filed claims. Dependent claims 3, 7, 8, 9, and 11 are amended to depend from independent claim 14. New claim 35 is added as this limitation removed from previously pending claim 14. Independent claim 26 was originally a dependent Beauregard-type claim depending from independent claim 14, which is now re-written in independent form and corresponding to amended claim 14, with support provided by at least the reasons discussed *supra*. New claim 38 depends from claim 26, with its text corresponding to original claim 22. Independent claim 29 is amended with support provided as discussed in relation to the amendments to claim 14 discussed *supra*. New claim 36 is a means-plus-function format claim corresponding to amended claim 14, with support provided as

In re ANINDYA CHAKRABORTY, Application No. 09/813,576  
Amendment B

discussed in relation to the amendments to claim 14 discussed *supra*, as well as original/previously pending claims 33 and 34. New claim 37 depends from claim 36, with its text corresponding to original claim 22. No new matter is added with these amendments.

Applicants believe all claims are allowable for at least the reasons that the prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests the duplicating a plurality of entries of a first database to a second database and maintaining said entries in synchronization between the first database and second database using a combined bulk and transactional update scheme, wherein bulk updating refers to the initial updating of the second database with sets of multiple entries from the first database and transactional updating refers to the updating of entries as they are applied to the first database to the second database for entries that are no longer subject to said initial bulk updating as recited (or a variant thereof) in each of the pending independent claims. Therefore, all pending claims patently distinctly define these terms differently than presented in the Office actions. Applicants incorporate by reference the remarks presented in Amendment A addressing the rejections. Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw all rejections and allow all claims in view of these amendments which clarify the terms used and patently define the claims over the prior art of record, which, according to MPEP § 706 and 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2) is the best prior art references available. As the prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests all the claim limitations of the pending claims, then all pending claims are believed to be allowable over the best prior art available, and Applicants request the claims be allowed and the application pass to issuance.

Applicant believes a two-month extension of time is required, and hereby petitions any extension of time required and has included herewith a credit card payment form (PTO-2038) for payment of the extension fee, and Applicant's representative hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge/credit any additional associated fees to Deposit Account No. 501430.


In re ANINDYA CHAKRABORTY, Application No. 09/813,576  
Amendment B

In view of the above remarks and for at least the reasons presented herein, all pending claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Office is respectfully requested to issue a timely Notice of allowance in this case. If, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams

Date: January 5, 2006

By

 1/5/2006  
Kirk D. Williams, Reg. No. 42,229  
One of the Attorneys for Applicant  
CUSTOMER NUMBER 26327  
The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams  
1234 S. OGDEN ST., Denver, CO 80210  
303-282-0151 (telephone), 303-778-0748 (facsimile)